

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Felecia A. Rotellini Superintendent of Financial Institutions Janet Napolitano Governor

April 4, 2008



Via Certified Mail

David Ware, President Regal Mortgage Company dba Regal Online Mortgage Guarantee Mortgage Corporation 2575 E. Camelback Road, Suite 450 Phoenix, AZ 85016

Reference: Docket # 08F-BD050-BNK / Regal Mortgage Company dba Regal Online Mortgage Guarantee Mortgage Corporation

Dear Mr. Ware:

Please find the enclosed formal Notice of Hearing. The hearing is scheduled for May 12, 2008, at 1:30 p.m. at the Office of Administrative Hearings, 1400 West Washington, Suite 101, Phoenix, Arizona.

Please contact Assistant Attorney General Craig Raby at (602) 542-8889 with any questions.

Very truly yours,

Robert D. Charlton Assistant Superintendent

RDC:sll

Enclosures

cc: Craig Raby, Assistant Attorney General

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

In the Matter of the Mortgage Broker License of:

No. 08F-BD050-BNK

REGAL MORTGAGE COMPANY DBA REGAL ONLINE MORTGAGE

2575 E. Camelback Road, Suite 450 Phoenix, AZ 85016

NOTICE OF HEARING

5

1

2

3

4

6

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Petitioner.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes ("A.R.S.") §§ 6-137, 6-138, and 41-1092.02, the above-captioned matter will be heard through the Office of Administrative Hearings, an independent agency, and is scheduled for May 12, 2008, at 1:30 p.m., at the Office of Administrative Hearings, 1400 West Washington, Suite 101, Phoenix, Arizona, (602) 542-9826 (the "Hearing").

The purpose of the Hearing is to determine if grounds exist for: (1) the issuance of an order pursuant to A.R.S. § 6-137 directing Petitioner to cease and desist from the violative conduct and to take the appropriate affirmative actions, within a reasonable period of time prescribed by the Superintendent, to correct the conditions resulting from the unlawful acts, practices, and transactions; (2) the imposition of a civil monetary penalty pursuant to A.R.S. § 6-132; (3) the suspension or revocation of Petitioner's license pursuant to A.R.S. § 6-905; and (4) an order or any other remedy necessary or proper for the enforcement of statutes and rules regulating mortgage brokers pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 6-123 and 6-131.

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 6-138, the Superintendent of Financial Institutions for the State of Arizona (the "Superintendent") delegates the authority vested in the Superintendent, whether implied or expressed, to the Director of the Office of Administrative Hearings or the Director's designee to preside over the Hearing as the Administrative Law Judge, to make written recommendations to the Superintendent consisting of proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order. The Office of Administrative Hearings has designated Michael Wales, at the address and phone number listed above, as the Administrative Law Judge for these proceedings. Pursuant to Arizona Administrative

Superintendent retains authority to enter orders granting a stay, orders on motions for rehearing, final decisions pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-1092.08 or other order or process which the Administrative Law Judge is specifically prohibited from entering.

Motions to continue this matter shall be made in writing to the Administrative Law Judge not

Code ("A.A.C.") Rule 2-19-104 and A.R.S. §§ 41-1092.01(H)(1) and 41-1092.08, the

Motions to continue this matter shall be made in writing to the Administrative Law Judge **not** less than fifteen (15) days prior to the date set for the Hearing. A copy of any motion to continue shall be mailed or hand-delivered to the opposing party on the same date of filing with the Office of Administrative Hearings.

A.R.S. § 41-1092.07 entitles any person affected by this Hearing to appear in person and by counsel, or to proceed without counsel during the giving of all evidence, to have a reasonable opportunity to inspect all documentary evidence, to cross-examine witnesses, to present evidence and witnesses in support of his/her interests, and to have subpoenas issued by the Administrative Law Judge to compel attendance of witnesses and production of evidence. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-1092.07(B), any person may appear on his or her own behalf or by counsel.

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-1092.07(E), a clear and accurate record of the proceedings will be made by a court reporter or by electronic means. Any party that requests a transcript of the proceedings shall pay the cost of the transcript for the court reporter or other transcriber.

Questions concerning issues raised in this Notice of Hearing should be directed to Assistant Attorney General Craig A. Raby, (602) 542-8889, 1275 West Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007.

NOTICE OF APPLICABLE RULES

On February 7, 1978, the Arizona Department of Financial Institutions (the "Department") adopted A.A.C. R20-4-1201 through R20-4-1220, which were amended September 12, 2001, setting forth the rules of practice and procedure applicable in contested cases and appealable agency actions before the Superintendent. The hearing will be conducted pursuant to these rules and the rules governing procedures before the Office of Administrative Hearings, A.A.C. R2-19-101 through R2-19-122. A copy of these rules is enclosed.

Pursuant to A.A.C. R20-4-1209, Petitioner shall file a written answer within twenty (20) days after issuance of this Notice of Hearing. The answer shall briefly state the Petitioner's position or defense and shall specifically admit or deny each of the assertions contained in this Notice of Hearing. If the answering Petitioner is without or are unable to reasonably obtain knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of an assertion, Petitioner shall so state, which shall have the effect of a denial. Any assertion not denied is deemed admitted. When Petitioner intends to deny only a part or a qualification of an assertion, or to qualify an assertion, Petitioner shall expressly admit so much of it as is true and shall deny the remainder. Any defense not raised in the answer is deemed waived.

If a timely answer is not filed, pursuant to A.A.C. R20-4-1209(D), Petitioner will be deemed in default and the Superintendent may deem the allegations in this Notice of Hearing as true and admitted and the Superintendent may take whatever action is appropriate, including suspension, revocation, denial of Petitioner's license or affirming an order to Cease and Desist and imposition of a civil penalty or restitution to any injured party.

Petitioner's answer shall be mailed or delivered to the Arizona Department of Financial Institutions, 2910 North 44th Street, Suite 310, Phoenix, Arizona 85018, with a copy mailed or delivered to the Office of Administrative Hearings, 1400 West Washington, Suite 101, Phoenix, Arizona 85007 and to Assistant Attorney General Craig A. Raby, Consumer Protection & Advocacy Section, Attorney General's Office, 1275 West Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007.

Persons with disabilities may request reasonable accommodations such as interpreters, alternative format or assistance with physical accessibility. Requests for accommodations must be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodations. If accommodations are required, call the Office of Administrative Hearings at (602) 542-9826.

FACTS

 Petitioner Regal Mortgage Company, Inc. ("Regal") is a New Mexico corporation authorized to transact business in Arizona as a mortgage broker, license number MB 0904728,

within the meaning of A.R.S. §§ 6-901, et seq. The nature of Regal's business is that of making, negotiating, or offering to make or negotiate loans secured by Arizona real property, within the meaning of A.R.S. § 6-901(6).

- 2. A September 27, 2007 through October 2, 2007, examination of Regal, conducted by the Department, revealed that Regal:
 - a. Failed to conduct the minimum elements of reasonable employee investigations before hiring employees, specifically:
 - i. Petitioner failed to obtain a completed and properly dated Employment Eligibility Verification Form ("19") before hiring eight (8) employees;
 - ii. Petitioner failed to collect complete Immigration Reform Control documents prior to hiring five (5) employees;
 - iii. Petitioner failed to obtain a completed and signed employment application ("EA") before hiring two (2) employees;
 - iv. Petitioner failed to obtain a signed statement and detailed information regarding an applicant's felony convictions ("SS") before hiring nine (9) employees;
 - v. Petitioner failed to consult with the applicant's most recent or next most recent employer ("EI") before hiring nine (9) employees;
 - vi. Petitioner failed to inquire regarding an applicant's qualifications and competence for the position ("QI") before hiring nine (9) employees;
 - vii. Petitioner failed to obtain a current credit report from a credit reporting agency ("CR") before hiring eight (8) employees;
 - viii. Petitioner failed to obtain an explanation for derogatory credit before hiring five (5) employees; and
 - ix. Petitioner failed to correct this violation from its previous examination;
 - b. Failed to reconcile and update all records specified in A.A.C. R20-4-917(B) in each

calendar quarter, specifically:

- i. Petitioner failed to reconcile its accounts since June 2007; and
- ii. Petitioner failed to correct this violation from its previous examination;
- c. Failed to maintain a complete record containing all documents as required;
 - i. Petitioner failed to provide minutes for review at the Department's examination;
- d. Failed to maintain all required information on its list of all executed loan applications or executed fee agreements, specifically:
 - i. Petitioner's loan list failed to contain a provision for entering the application date or name of loan officer;
 - ii. Petitioner's loan list failed to include declined and withdrawn applications;
 - iii. Petitioner's loan list failed to have separate entries for disposition and disposition date; and
 - iv. Petitioner failed to correct this violation from its previous examination;
- e. Petitioner failed to maintain originals or clearly legible copies of all mortgage loan transactions for not fewer than five years, specifically:
 - i. Petitioner failed to keep and maintain the withdrawal, cancellation, or denial notice for two (2) borrowers;
- f. Failed to comply with the disclosure requirements of Title I of the Consumer Credit Protection Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 1601 through 1666j), the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (12 U.S.C. §§ 2601 through 2617), and the regulations promulgated under these acts, specifically:
 - i. Petitioner failed to provide complete Truth in Lending ("TIL") disclosures to five (5) borrowers;
 - ii. Petitioner failed to disclose the Yield Spread Premium ("YSP") on the Good Faith Estimate ("GFE") to four (4) borrowers;

- iii. Petitioner failed to provide complete, updated Servicing Transfer (ST") disclosures to five (5) borrowers; and
- iv. Petitioner failed to correct this violation from its previous examination;
- g. Failed to keep and maintain at all times correct and complete records as prescribed by the Superintendent, specifically:
 - Petitioner failed to maintain complete records, evidenced by the fact that it was unable to provide any back-up documents;
- h. Failed to use a written agreement, signed by all parties, when accepting fees and/or documents in connection with mortgage loan applications, specifically:
 - i. Petitioner failed to maintain a statutorily correct written agreement in the loan files of at least four (4) borrowers; and
 - ii. Petitioner failed to correct this violation from its previous examination;
- Failed to ensure that the Responsible Individual maintained a position of active management, specifically:
 - Petitioner's Responsible Individual, David Ware, failed to be in active management as evidenced by his failure to ensure Petitioner's compliance with Arizona Statutes and Rules governing mortgage brokers;
- j. Failed to notify the Superintendent prior to maintaining branch records at its principal place of business, specifically:
 - Petitioner failed to notify the Superintendent that it has maintained branch
 office records at its principal place of business office, financials with its
 accountant, and organizational files with its lawyer;
- k. Used an appraisal disclosure that places an unlawful 90-day limit on the amount of time in which a borrower may obtain a copy of an appraisal for which the borrower has paid;
 - i. Petitioner has used a disclosure entitled "NOTICE OF RIGHT TO RECEIVE

AN APPRAISAL REPORT" that includes a 90-day limit on the amount of time an applicant may request the appraisal; and

- Failed to obtain the Superintendent's approval of its use of a computer or mechanical recordkeeping system, specifically:
 - i. Petitioner failed to provide the Superintendent with advance written notice seeking approval of its computer or mechanical record keeping system, as evidenced by copies of its financial and other records appearing to be generated from one or more computer systems.
- 3. Based upon the above findings, the Department issued and served upon Regal a Notice of Assessment on February 11, 2008.
- On March 13, 2008, Petitioner filed a Request For Hearing to appeal the Notice of Assessment.

LAW

- 1. Pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 6-901, et seq., the Superintendent has the authority and duty to regulate all persons engaged in the mortgage broker business and with the enforcement of statutes, rules, and regulations relating to mortgage brokers.
 - 2. By the conduct set forth in the Findings of Fact, Regal violated the following:
 - a. A.R.S. § 6-903(N) and A.A.C. R20-4-102 by failing to conduct the minimum elements of reasonable employee investigations before hiring employees;
 - A.A.C. R20-4-917(C) by failing to reconcile and update all records specified in
 A.A.C. R20-4-917(B) in each calendar quarter;
 - c. A.A.C. R20-4-917(B)(9) by failing to maintain a complete record containing all documents as required;
 - d. A.A.C. R20-4-917(B)(1) by failing to maintain all required information on its list of all executed loan applications or executed fee agreements,
 - e. A.R.S. § 6-906(A) and A.A.C. R20-4-917(B)(6) by failing to maintain originals or

clearly legible copies of all mortgage loan transactions for not fewer than five years,

- f. A.R.S. § 6-906(D) and A.A.C. R20-4-917(B)(6)(e) by failing to comply with the disclosure requirements of Title I of the Consumer Credit Protection Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 1601 through 1666j), the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (12 U.S.C. §§ 2601 through 2617), and the regulations promulgated under these acts,
- g. A.R.S. § 6-906(A) and A.A.C. R20-4-917(B) by failing to keep and maintain at all times correct and complete records as prescribed by the Superintendent,
- h. A.R.S. § 6-906(C) by failing to use a written agreement, signed by all parties, when accepting fees and/or documents in connection with mortgage loan applications,
- A.R.S. § 6-903(E) and A.A.C. R20-4-102 by failing to ensure that the Responsible Individual maintained a position of active management,
- j. A.R.S. § 6-906(A) by failing to notify the Superintendent prior to maintaining branch records at is principal place of business,
- k. A.R.S. § 6-906(C) by using an appraisal disclosure that places an unlawful 90-day limit on the amount of time in which a borrower may obtain a copy of an appraisal for which the borrower has paid;
- 1. A.A.C. R20-4-917(A) by failing to obtain the Superintendent's approval of its use of a computer or mechanical recordkeeping system,
- 3. The violations, set forth above, constitute grounds for: (1) the issuance of an order pursuant to A.R.S. § 6-137 directing Petitioner to cease and desist from the violative conduct and to take the appropriate affirmative actions, within a reasonable period of time prescribed by the Superintendent, to correct the conditions resulting from the unlawful acts, practices, and transactions; (2) the imposition of a civil monetary penalty pursuant to A.R.S. § 6-132; (3) the suspension or revocation of Petitioner's license pursuant to A.R.S. § 6-905; and (4) an order or any other remedy necessary or proper for the enforcement of statutes and rules regulating mortgage brokers pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 6-123 and 6-131.

1 WHEREFORE, if after a hearing, the Superintendent makes a finding of one or more of the 2 above-described violations, the Superintendent may affirm the February 11, 2008 Notice of 3 Assessment, pursuant to A.R.S. § 6-137; impose a civil money penalty pursuant to A.R.S. § 6-132; suspend or revoke Petitioner's license pursuant to A.R.S. § 6-905; and order any other remedy necessary or proper for the enforcement of statutes and rules regulating mortgage brokers pursuant to 6 A.R.S. §§ 6-123 and 6-131. 7 8 Felecia A. Rotellini Superintendent of Financial Institutions 9 10 Assistant Superintendent of Financial Institutions 11 12 ORIGINAL OF THE NOTICE OF HEARING filed this day of Opio, 2008 in the office of: 13 14 Felecia A. Rotellini Superintendent of Financial Institutions Arizona Department of Financial Institutions Attn: Susan L. Longo 2910 N. 44th Street, Suite 310 16 Phoenix, AZ 85018 Man dato April 17 COPY of the foregoing mailed/delive 18 Michael Wales, Administrative Law. Office of Administrative Hearings 19 1400 W. Washington, Suite 101 Phoenix, AZ 85007 20 Craig A. Raby, Assistant Attorney G Attorney General's Office 1275 West Washington 22 Phoenix, AZ 85007 23 Robert D. Charlton, Assistant Super Chris Dunshee, Senior Examiner 24

Arizona Department of Financial In 2910 N. 44th Street, Suite 310

Phoenix, AZ 85018

26

1	AND COPY MAILED SAME DATE by Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested, to:
2	
3	Regal Mortgage Company dba Regal Online Mortgage Guarantee Mortgage Corporation c/o David Ware, President
4	2575 E. Camelback Road, Suite 450
5	Phoenix, AZ 85016 Petitioner
6	David Ware, Statutory Agent For:
7	Regal Mortgage Company dba Regal Online Mortgage Guarantee Mortgage Corporation
8	2575 E. Camelback Road, Suite 450 Phoenix, AZ 85016
9	1 40
10	163738; PHX-AGN-2007-0525
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	